

CONTRACT INSPECTION REPORT		CONTRACT NO. <div style="border:1px solid black; width:100px; height:20px;"></div>	TASK NO. <div style="border:1px solid black; width:100px; height:20px;"></div>		
TO: CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION & SETTLEMENT BRANCH/PD/OL		DATE 12 October 1966			
		INSPECTION REPORT NO. (If final, so state) 6			
		ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE Phase I - complete 1 July 1967 - Phase II			
NAME OF CONTRACTOR <div style="border:1px solid black; width:200px; height:20px;"></div>					
TYPE OF COMMODITY OR SERVICE Phase I Design Study and Demonstration/ Automatic Multiple Image Integration Study					
THE CONTRACTOR IS ON SCHEDULE <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO		THE CONTRACTOR WILL PROBABLY REMAIN WITHIN ALLOCATED FUNDS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO IF ANSWER IS "NO" ADVISE RECOMMENDATION AND/OR ACTION OF SPONSORING OFFICE, ON REVERSE HEREOF. IF KNOWN, INDICATE MAGNITUDE OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS INVOLVED.			
PER CENT OF WORK COMPLETED - Phase I - 100%, Phase II - 0%					
PER CENT OF FUNDS EXPENDED - 30%					
HAS AN INTERIM REPORT, FINAL REPORT, PROTOTYPE, OR OTHER END ITEM BEEN RECEIVED FROM THE CONTRACTOR DURING THE PERIOD? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO (If yes, give details on reverse side.)					
HAS GOVERNMENT-OWNED PROPERTY BEEN DELIVERED TO CONTRACTOR DURING THIS PERIOD? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO (If yes, indicate items, quantity, and cost on reverse side.)					
INCENTIVES					
IS THIS AN INCENTIVE CONTRACT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO IF YES, CHECK TYPE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> COST <input type="checkbox"/> PERFORMANCE <input type="checkbox"/> DELIVERY		NOTE: USE REVERSE SIDE FOR COMMENTS. FINAL REPORT MUST CONTAIN INCENTIVE EVALUATION.			
OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF CONTRACTOR					
1. <input type="checkbox"/> OUTSTANDING	3. <input type="checkbox"/> ABOVE AVERAGE	5. <input type="checkbox"/> BELOW AVERAGE	7. <input type="checkbox"/> UNSATISFACTORY		
2. <input type="checkbox"/> EXCELLENT	4. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AVERAGE	6. <input type="checkbox"/> BARELY ADEQUATE			
IF OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF CONTRACTOR IS UNSATISFACTORY OR BARELY ADEQUATE, INDICATE REASONS ON REVERSE SIDE.					
RECOMMENDED ACTION					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CONTINUE AS PROGRAMMED		<input type="checkbox"/> WITHHOLD PAYMENT PENDING SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE			
<input type="checkbox"/> TERMINATE		<input type="checkbox"/> OTHER (Specify)			
IF TERMINATION IS RECOMMENDED OR IF THIS IS A FINAL REPORT PUT COMMENTS ON REVERSE IN NARRATIVE FORM ON CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE AND CERTIFY THAT ALL DELIVERABLE ITEMS UNDER THE CONTRACT HAVE BEEN RECEIVED. THESE INCLUDE, WHERE APPLICABLE, THE FOLLOWING:					
ITEM	REC'D	DOES NOT APPLY	ITEM	REC'D	DOES NOT APPLY
PROTOTYPES			MANUALS		
DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS			FINAL REPORT		
PRODUCTION AND/OR OTHER END ITEMS			SPECIAL TOOLING		
			OTHER GOVERNMENT PROPERTY		
DATE OF LAST CONTACT WITH CONTRACTOR 6 October 1966					
SIGNATURE OF INSPECTOR <div style="border:1px solid black; width:300px; height:40px;"></div>			DIVISION		
IN			<div style="border:1px solid black; width:150px; height:40px;"></div>		
Approved For Release 2004/07/29 : CIA-RDP78B04770A000200010033-4			Declass Review by		

☐ SECRET

☒ CONFIDENTIAL

☐ UNCLASSIFIED

Approved For Release 2004/07/29 : CIA-RDP78B04770A000200010033-4

NARRATIVE REPORT

☒ INTERIM

☐ FINAL

At a meeting held early in September at [] [] was informed that the Proposed Change of Scope, dated 10 August 1966 had been rejected. He was informed that a good many of the proposed study areas would be covered under the EROS and ASSP contracts. He was instructed to prepare a proposal and work statement from the electronic approach to integration defining the limitations in terms of MTF, S/N and BW with variables such as resolution, attitude distortion, focal length, shadow, relief, etc. [] was asked to think in terms of a printer approach and not of optical viewing.

The project monitor met with [] at [] on 6 October 1966 to review the rough copy of their proposal. It was rejected.

[] was informed to make their proposal and work statement more comprehensive and factual. They were asked to indicate the areas they intended to study and run test in. They were asked to shift from straight MTF curves and indicate the net gain that might be achieved by electronic image integration. They were also asked to approach this with the idea of using material of input in the 150-200 lines/mm region. [] was asked to include what the limitations of MTF and S/N are, since they seem much more serious than Bandwidth.

[] agreed to come with a comprehensive proposal the week of 23 October 1966.

☐ UNCLASSIFIED

☒ CONFIDENTIAL

☐ SECRET